SIMTEK6895

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

In re Application of

App. No.:	10/709243
Filed:	April 23, 2004
Conf. No.:	3242
Title:	ARMATURE OF ROTARY ELECTRICAL APPARATUS
Examiner:	Y. Comas
Art Unit:	2834

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action, dated June 19, 2006, the Finality of which has been withdrawn, please the Examiner is most respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections of the following claims without further amendment.

THE CLAIMS

1. (Previously Amended) An armature construction for a rotating electrical machine comprised of a core consisting of a plurality of laminated plates having a circular member from which a plurality of pole teeth radially extend, a pair of insulators positioned on opposite axial sides of said core and having cooperating tooth engaging portions encircling said pole teeth and receiving coil windings there around, a wiring base positioned on one axial side of one of said insulators, said wiring base being made from an insulating material and receiving and retaining the wire ends of the coil windings, and interconnecting members formed on said one insulator and said wiring base for connecting said wiring base in a predetermined axial, radial and circumferential position.

2. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 1 wherein the interconnecting members comprise a pair of interconnecting elements, one on each of the one insulator and the wiring base.

3. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 1 wherein there are a plurality of circumferentially spaced interconnecting members.

4. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 3 wherein each of the interconnecting members comprise a pair of interconnecting elements, one on each of the one insulator and the wiring base.

5. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 2 wherein the interconnecting elements are engageable upon relative axial movement of the wiring base and the insulator in one direction and once engaged prevent relative movement in a direction opposite the one direction.

6. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 5 wherein the interconnecting elements comprise a barbed hook and a receiver therefore.

7. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 6 wherein there are a plurality of circumferentially spaced interconnecting members.

8. (Previously Amended) An armature construction as set forth in claim 1 wherein there is further provided on the wiring base and the insulator a cooperating cylindrical flange and circumferentially spaced interengaging shoulders for assisting in the radial positioning.

9. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 8 wherein the interconnecting members comprise a pair of interconnecting elements, one on each of the one insulator and the wiring base.

10. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 8 wherein there are a plurality of

circumferentially spaced interconnecting members.

11. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 10 wherein each of the interconnecting members comprise a pair of interconnecting elements, one on each of the one insulator and the wiring base.

12. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 9 wherein the interconnecting elements are engageable upon relative axial movement of the wiring base and the insulator in one direction and once engaged prevent relative movement in a direction opposite the one direction.

13. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 12 wherein the interconnecting elements comprise a barbed hook and a receiver therefore.

14. (Original) An armature construction as set forth in claim 13 wherein there are a plurality of circumferentially spaced interconnecting members.

REMARKS

In the first Office Action the Examiner took the position that Michaels et al showed the entire construction of claim 1 including the pairs of insulators that surrounded the pole teeth and to which the wiring base was connected in a fixed position. Applicant argued that this was not the case and the Examiner now apparently agrees and newly cites the Laurie patent as a showing of the use of insulating halves that could be employed with Michaels. But fails to suggest why one skilled in the art would make such a modification.

It is most respectfully submitted that only an Examiner would propose such a modification because each reference is complete in itself and the combination would only complicate the construction and defeat the intended purpose of each reference.

Figure 10 of Michaels clearly indicates there is no insulating bobbin. This has tabs that cooperate with the core for location and assembly. Thus if an insulating bobbin of two pieces were employed the wiring base would again be connected directly to the core and not to the nonexistent insulating two piece bobbin.

In addition in Laurie the wiring base is formed integrally with one bobbin half. Thus a separate locating position is unnecessary and would defeat the basic purpose of this reference. It is well established that those skilled in the art would not combine references in such a way that neither served its intended purpose.

The dependent claims all partake of this patentable difference and further recite features that require the Examiner to further stretch his combination. However, in view of the significant differences from the basic combination, it is not believed necessary to argue these other differences at this time.

In view of this favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time